

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,082	04/24/2001	Joo Soo Lim	049128-5006	2174
9629	7590 11/03/2004	EXAMINER		NER
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			QI, ZHI QIANG	
	YLVANIA AVENUE NW ON, DC 20004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	, 20 2000		2871	
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· ·					
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/840,082	LIM ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Mike Qi	2871		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the provision of the provi		e timely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30	September 2004.			
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,11-13,15-17,19 and 21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9,11-13,15-17,19 and 21 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachmen	at(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summ			
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 or No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Ma			

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Sep.30, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of US 6,297,862 (Murade).

<u>Claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 15 and 19, AAPA discloses (the specification of page 2, paragraph 0003 – page 4, paragraph 0008; Figs. 1-3) a conventional liquid crystal display comprising:</u>

(concerning claims 1 and 11)

- a pixel electrode (10) at a pixel area between a gate line (14) and data line (13);

Art Unit: 2871

- a switching device (thin film transistor TFT) (12) at an intersection between the gate line (14) and the data line (13), and the function of the TFT is to drive the pixel electrode in order to display image;

- drain electrode (7) of the TFT is made of <u>metal</u> (metal thin film) connected to the pixel electrode (10) (see Fig.2);
- a light-shielding member (black matrix) (11) overlapping the switching device
 (TFT) (12);

(concerning claims 5 and 15)

- a <u>charging device</u> (a storage capacitor between the gate line 14 as the lower electrode and the upper <u>metal</u> thin film 15 as the upper electrode) on the gate line (14), therefore, the <u>charging device</u> is a storage capacitor including the upper electrode (metal) (15) and the gate line (14) and a gate insulating layer (4) (dielectric layer) between the gate line (14) and the upper electrode (15); or forming a <u>charging device</u> including upper electrode (15) made of <u>metal</u> over the gate line (14) and a gate insulating layer (dielectric layer);
- a light-shielding member (black matrix) (11) overlapping the switching device
 (TFT) (12);
- a light-shielding member (black matrix) (11) overlapping the charging device (the storage capacitor);

(concerning claims 1, 9 and 19)

 drain electrode (7) made of <u>metal</u> (first metal thin film) connected to the pixel electrode (10) (see Fig.2);

upper electrode (15) made of <u>metal</u> (second metal thin film) over the gate line
 (14) and a gate insulating layer (4) (dielectric layer);

- a light-shielding member (black matrix) (11) on a front substrate (2) opposed to the rear substrate (1), and at a boundary portion between pixel areas (10);
- a light-shielding member (black matrix) (11) for blocking light incident onto the drain electrode (7) (first metal thin film) of the switching device (TFT) (12) and for blocking light incident onto the storage capacitor upper electrode (15) (second metal thin film).

AAPA does not expressly disclose the light-shielding member (black matrix) extending from an end at the pixel electrode side of a drain electrode (metal thin film) of the TFT (the extending portion would be a dummy black matrix) and extending from an end at the pixel electrode side of the storage capacitor upper electrode (metal thin film) (the extending portion would be a dummy black matrix) into the pixel area, and the light-shielding member (black matrix) covering and extending past all sides of the drain electrode (metal thin film) with a margin sufficient to block light incident on the metal thin film.

However, Murade discloses (col.7, line 11 – col.9, line 67; col.16, line 43 – col.17, line 53; Figs.1, 2, 11-14, 20) that the shielding film (black matrix 6) is formed around the pixel, and the shielding film (black matrix 6) covering the switching device (TFT, such as the source/drain regions 1a and 1b) and extending from the drain region into the pixel area, and the light shielding member (black matrix 6) covering and extending over the drain/source region, and inherently, the light shielding member

(black matrix 6) also extending over the upper electrode of the storage capacitor (any two conductive layers and an insulating layer would constitute a capacitor) that is sufficient to block light incident onto the drain/source region (the metal thin film), and the light incident on the liquid crystal device does not affect the TFT performance, and a bright, high quality images will be ensured.

Page 5

Since such light-shielding arrangement would sufficiently block the light incident to the TFT, so as to minimize the leakage current of the TFT, such that the device can present a display of high quality images free from image degrading effect such as crosstalk.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to extend the light-shielding film covering the drain electrode and covering the storage capacitor upper electrode from an end of the pixel electrode side, i.e., a light-shielding member (black matrix) covering and extending the drain electrode (metal thin film) and covering the upper electrode of a storage capacitor (charging device) with a margin sufficiently blocking light incident onto the drain electrode as claimed in claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 15 and 19 for minimizing the leakage current of the TFT, improving the display contrast, and presenting a display of high quality images free from image degrading effect such as cross-talk.

Claims 2, 6, 12 and 16, AAPA discloses (the specification of page 2, paragraph 0003 – page 4, paragraph 0008; Figs. 1-3) that the light-shielding member (11) is at a front substrate (2) opposed to a rear substrate (1) which includes the switching device

(TFT 12), pixel electrode (10), the charging device (storage capacitor), and a liquid crystal layer between the two substrates.

Claims 3, 7, 13 and 17, AAPA discloses (the specification of page 2, paragraph 0003 – page 4, paragraph 0008; Figs. 1-3) that the light-shielding member is a black matrix.

3. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Murade as applied to claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 15-17 and 19 above, and further in view of US 6,266,117 (Yanagawa et al).

<u>Claim 21</u>, lacking limitation is such that the material of the light-shielding member is an organic material containing a black pigment,

However, Yanagawa discloses (co.7, lines 1-2) that the light shielding film is made of an organic resin in which, e.g., black pigment is dispersed, so that using the organic resin containing a black pigment as a light shielding member would be a routing skill in the art, and that was common and known in the art as the light shielding property of the organic material containing a black pigment to absorb light.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to use an organic material containing a black pigment as a light shielding member as claimed in claim 21 for shielding light because the organic material containing a black pigment having the property to absorb light.

Art Unit: 2871

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on Sep.30, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The reference Murade clearly disclose (col.1, lines 30-41) that TFT is covered by a black matrix to prevent the channel region of the TFT from being exposed to direct light which would otherwise cause a leakage current. Murade also indicates (col.9, lines 49-67) that using black matrix (6) with ample margins covering, it effectively prevents direct impingement of incident light, and the incident light is prevented from being reflected from impinging on the channel region of the TFT, and hence it minimizes a leakage current of the TFT which otherwise would be generated if it were exposed to stay light, and such device presents a display of high quality image free from image degrading effect such as cross-talk, and that is the motivation. Accordingly, the incident light being prevented impinging to the TFT, so that the reflectivity of the display also being reduced, and that would have been at least obvious.

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 1) US 5,866,919 (Kwon et al) discloses (col.8, lines 4-19;Fig.5A) that a black matrix (58) is formed so as to cover the TFT and overlaps the pixel electrode (57) so as to prevent light leakage.

Art Unit: 2871

2) US 6,556,265 (Murade) discloses (col.1, lines 46-47) that there is the need to prevent reflected light from the surface of the TFT array substrate, and (col.16, lines 50-58; Fig.3) that light shielding film (23) is provided to the opposite substrate (20) to areas other than each of the pixel opening areas (covering and extending), so that the incident light never intrudes into the channel area of the TFT or source area and drain area, so as to improve the contrast.

- 3) US 6,268,895 (Shimada et al) discloses (col.12, lines 13-16) that generally, metal can be used as a material of the storage capacitor counter electrode.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571) 272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Qi October 27, 2004 POLITY H. KIM SUPSTRIEGNY PATENT FRAMINER TECHNOLOGY CLASSIN 2200